

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this subject application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's foreign priority claim to the Norwegian priority application number 971605, filed on April 8, 1997.

Acknowledgement of the foreign priority claim and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document are respectfully requested.

Claims 27-31, 35-38, 40, 41, 44, 49 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Claims 27-51 have been cancelled in favor of new claims 52-76. New claims 52-76 are believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 27-30, 34, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Chapman et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Chapman is an overview of the Telecommunications Information Network Architecture (TINA) as of June 1996. The TINA reference aims at defining an "open" architecture for telecommunication services. The architecture is based upon distributed computing, object orientation, and other concepts from the telecommunications and computing industries such as open distributed processing (ODP), intelligent networks (IN), telecommunication management networks (TMNs), asynchronous transfer mode (ATM), common object request broker architecture (CORBA), and the Digital Visual

Council (DAVIC). The main principles and objectives of the TINA architecture are described on page 136 under the heading "The TINA Overall Architecture."

To establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentec, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Every limitation contained in the claims must be present in the reference, and if even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Chapman fails to satisfy this rigorous standard.

Although Chapman makes the statement "most services are independent of the underlying technologies (computers and networks)," this is not true for mobile terminal mobility services. How to provide continuous services to a roaming mobile terminal moving from one cell or service area to a geographically different cell or service area is a problem that Chapman does not specifically resolve.

Chapman fails to disclose in independent claim 52:

means for supporting mobile radio terminal mobility transparency in the DPE such that an application program being executed at a mobile radio terminal located in one radio service area serviced via one radio base station is not interrupted or hindered in its execution when the mobile radio terminal moves to another radio service area serviced via another radio base station.

The Examiner alleges that Chapman discloses "mobility transparency" making reference to language on page 136, section 3, column 1, lines 22-32. Specifically, the Examiner refers to the statement "[t]he platform hides from applications the details of underlying

technologies and distribution concerns, thus supporting the construction of portable and inoperable code." Applicant finds no teaching in this quoted language of a "means for supporting mobile radio terminal mobility transparency" in the DPE as recited above. A general statement about supporting construction of portable and interoperable program coding is simply not what is claimed and is far too general to disclose mobile radio terminal mobility transparency in the DPE. Where does Chapman explain how mobile radio mobility transparency implemented?

Indeed, in November 1997, the inventor delivered a paper at a TINA Conference in Chile entitled, "Terminal Mobility Support in TINA" (copy to follow). That article demonstrated that the TINA architecture described in the Chapman article does not support mobile terminal mobility. See, for example, the Abstract of this article which states "as shown in [1] Access and Location transparencies defined for Open Distributed Processing (ODP), and TINA are unsufficient to support terminal mobility since interoperability between DPE platforms is not guaranteed at all times" (emphasis added). A copy of reference [1] will follow shortly for the Examiner's review. A major problem with the TINA architecture as described by Chapman is that a terminal agent or a user agent does not know where the user is currently physically located!

Hence, the Examiner's contention that Chapman discloses all of the features of the independent claim is improper. Therefore, the anticipation rejection based upon Chapman is improper and should be withdrawn.

DO
Appl. No. 09/412,334
February 17, 2004

Since none of the secondary references applied by the Examiner in the §103 rejections overcomes the primary deficiencies of Chapman with respect to the independent claim, the present application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:at
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100